

REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1, 3-5, 18, 20-21, 38, and 43-50 will remain pending in this application. Claims 2, 6-17, 19, 22-27, and 39-42 were previously cancelled. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added by the present amendment. In particular, Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter added to claims 1, 18, and 38 is supported in the Specification at least at paragraphs [0369] and [0371]. The additional subject matter added to claim 38 is supported in the Specification at least at paragraph [0377] and in the Drawings at least at Fig. 37C.

Claims 1, 3-5, 18, 20, 21, 38, and 43-50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1, 3-5, 18, 20-21, 38, and 43-50 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,704,743 (“Martin”).

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 3-5, 18, 20, 21, 38, and 43-50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. It is alleged that the claims contain subject matter that was not described in the Specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors possessed the claimed invention when the instant application was filed. In particular, it is alleged that claim 1 recites the limitations “defining an *initial* discrete storable unit of information having a type structure, attaching the extension to the type structure of the initial discrete storable unit of information, and creating a *new* discrete storable unit of information” (emphases added) and that these limitations are not described in the Specification to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the invention.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. As was noted in the paper filed March 19, 2008, the claims were amended to recite that a “discrete storable unit of information” is defined, as contrasted with an “*initial* discrete storable unit of information,” and that a “*customized* discrete storable unit of information” is created, as contrasted with a “*new* discrete storable unit of information” (emphases added).

These limitations are clearly supported in the instant Specification. For example, the limitation “defining a discrete storable unit of information having a type structure and a first identifier” is clearly disclosed at least at paragraphs [0016] (“The computer system further comprises a plurality of Items where each Item constitutes a *discrete storable unit of information* that can be manipulated by a hardware/software interface system . . .”), [0105]-[0111] (discussing the type structure of an Item, and particularly of a Location Item) and at Figs. 5A-5B (block diagrams illustrating example type structures of Items), and [0180] (“The ItemID field contains the ItemID of the item that the extension is associated with.”).

With regard to the limitation “creating a customized discrete storable unit of information,” support is found in the instant Specification at least at paragraph [0176] (“Since an Item type or Nested Element type defined by the initial set of storage platform schemas may not exactly match an ISV [independent software vendor] application's need, it is necessary to allow ISVs to customize the type. This is allowed with the notion of Extensions.”). Further, paragraphs [0178]-[0179] disclose an abstract type, Base.Extension, that serves as a root type for the hierarchy of extension types, and paragraphs [0180]-[0185] discuss the structure, creation, and behavior of extension types, as well as the rules that govern extension types. Paragraphs [0186]-[0192] disclose a specific example of creating customized extension types, CRMExtension and HRExtension, that are related to a Contact type. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that paragraphs [0176]-[0192] disclose the limitation “creating a customized discrete storable unit of information.” These paragraphs also disclose the limitation “attaching the extension to the type structure of the discrete storable unit of information” at least because, in the example discussed at paragraphs [0176]-[0192], the CRMExtension and HRExtension extension types are described as being “attached to Contact items” (see paragraph [0189]).

Applicant further submits that the limitations added to claim 1 in this paper, namely “attaching an extension to the type structure of the discrete storable unit of information by defining an extension instance of the extension type, the extension instance being identified by the first identifier and an extension identifier and stored and accessible separately from the discrete storable unit of information,” is supported in the instant Specification at least at paragraphs [0369] (discussing the ItemID and ExtensionID properties and disclosing that the

pair (ItemID, ExtensionID) uniquely identifies an Extension instance) and [0371] (“The Extension instances are stored and accessed separately from the Item.”).

Based at least on the above reasoning, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claimed limitations are supported in the Specification and requests that the rejection of claims 1, 3-5, 18, 20, 21, 38, and 43-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 3-5, 18, 20-21, 38, and 43-50 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Martin. As to claim 1, the rejection is understood to be based on the premise that Martin discloses the claimed limitations “defining an initial discrete storable unit of information having a type structure,” “defining an extension representative of a desired additional data structure,” and “attaching the extension to the type structure of the initial discrete storable unit of information.”

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 1, as amended above, recites a method for customizing a discrete storable unit of information. The method includes defining a discrete storable unit of information having a type structure and a first identifier and an extension type representative of a desired additional data structure. An extension is attached to the type structure of the discrete storable unit of information by defining an extension instance of the extension type. The extension instance is identified by the first identifier and an extension identifier and is stored and accessible separately from the discrete storable unit of information. A customized discrete storable unit of information is created.

By contrast, Applicant respectfully submits that Martin does not disclose all of the limitations recited in claim 1, as amended above. In particular, Martin does not disclose the step of defining an extension instance of the extension type that is (1) identified by the first identifier and an extension identifier and (2) is stored and accessible separately from the discrete storable unit of information.

For at least this reason and the reasons discussed in the amendment filed March 19, 2008, Applicant respectfully submits that Martin does not disclose all of the limitations recited in claim 1 and that claim 1 is therefore patentable over Martin. Claims 3-5 and 43-46

depend from claim 1 and are also patentable over Martin at least by reason of this dependency.

Claim 18 has been amended to recite limitations similar to those recited in claim 1, as amended above. Accordingly, claim 18 is also patentable over Martin. Claims 20-21 and 47-50 depend from claim 18 and are also patentable over Martin at least by reason of this dependency.

Claim 38 has also been amended to recite limitations similar to those recited in claim 1, as amended above. In addition, claim 38 recites additional limitations that further distinguish various embodiments from Martin. In particular claim 38, as amended above, recites the limitation “attaching extensions to the type structure of the discrete storable unit of information by defining a first extension instance of the first extension type, the first extension instance being identified by the first identifier and a first extension identifier and the second extension instance being identified by the first identifier and a second extension identifier, the first extension instance and the second extension instance being stored and accessible separately from the discrete storable unit of information.” Accordingly, claim 38 recites two extension instances attached to the type structure of the discrete storable unit of information. As disclosed at paragraph [0377] of the instant Specification, this solution allows different applications (APPX and APPY, for example) to separately extend a Contact item to include respective additional fields that are used by each application. Thus, multiple instantiations of the Contact item are avoided (contrast paragraph [0375] of the Specification), and both applications can extend the Contact item, unlike partial solutions in which the Contact item's properties are directly extended (contrast paragraph [0376]).

Based at least on the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the currently pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record and requests reconsideration and removal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

DOCKET NO.: 305642.03 / MSFT-2847
Application No.: 10/693,574
Office Action Dated: July 22, 2008

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: October 22, 2008

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman

Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439